


## REMARKS

In response to the official office action of December 1, 2004, applicant has canceled claim 1 in view of the prior art, and has rewritten claim 2 as a new base claim including the limitations of the original base claim, and also acknowledges the allowance of claims 6 & 7. Also, applicant has amended the specification by deleting reference numeral 21 which is not shown in the FIGS. to overcome the examiner's objection of the drawings. Further, applicant disagrees with the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as anticipated by Seidl and also disagrees with the objection of claims 2-7, because Seidl describes a guard member 50 being made of various resilient or yielding forming-retaining materials; whereas, the present invention describes a rigid shell. There are no degrees of rigidness associated with the word rigid unless qualifiers are used such as semi-rigid. According to the New World Webster's Dictionary, the word rigid is defined as "unyielding; stiff and hard". In addition, claim 2 describes that the reason for the rigid shell is so that the rigid shell will not rest against the ~~breast~~ of the nursing mother, but instead will fit about the breast. The guard member 50 in Seidl will not accomplish the function as described in claim 2 of the present invention.

Applicant has not added any new subject matter to the claims and respectfully request that the examiner takes the foregoing into consideration and that she be granted Letters Patent for her invention.

Respectfully Submitted,  
For: Marika Cisneros

By:   
David A. Lingbeck  
Reg. No. 34,861  
P.O. Box 500  
St. Michael, Minnesota 55376  
(763) 497-0529